



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,687	01/24/2002	Shell S. Simpson	10008198-1	1020
7590	10/04/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			DALENCOURT, YVES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/056,687	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yves Dalencourt	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


YVES DALENCOURT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 07/24/06.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 2, 4, and 8.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 - 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso et al (US 2002/0116291; hereinafter Grasso) in view of Hamzy et al (US 6,623,527; hereinafter Hamzy).

Regarding claims 1, 19, and 26, Grasso teaches a method and system for accessing and sharing data (200, fig. 3), comprising the steps of configuring data at least partially obtained from an enterprise resource planning system (210, fig. 3; paragraph [0057]; [0058], lines 1 – 3; and [0062], lines 1 – 4; Grasso discloses a distributed knowledge management service provider, wherein said service provider is an enterprise resource planning uses to extract content from captured documents and indexed); storing said data (paragraphs [0058], lines 3 – 8; [0062], lines 7 – 13; Grasso discloses that the service provider 210 records the document 120 in the digital archive it host for the user 50); sending one or more generic access instruction from a first server (paragraph [0063]); and identifying said data to be accessed in response to a generic access instruction (paragraph [0058], lines 8 – 12; [0059]; and [0064]; Grasso discloses that the service provider 210 then transmits the print job to the user's printer 112 where the printed document is produced).

Grasso teaches substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically teach the step of supplying from a printing apparatus having an embedded web server, a different one of the generic access instruction operable for providing a print dialog box with selectable options for printing said data with the printing apparatus.

However, Hamzy teaches an analogous method for providing a document with a button for a network service, which comprises the step of supplying from a printing apparatus having an embedded web server, a different one of the generic access instructions operable for providing a print dialog box with selectable options for printing said data with the printing apparatus (figs 2 – 4; col. 2, lines 38 – 52; col. 4, line 33 through col. 5, line 8).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Grasso by supplying from a printing apparatus having an embedded web server, a different one of the generic access instructions operable for providing a print dialog box with selectable options for printing said data with the printing apparatus as evidenced by Hamzy for the purpose of allowing user(s) to print on a network printer from a thin client using a minimum of local resources, thereby reducing or eliminating the need for a great number of printer drivers and associated resources at the thin client.

Regarding claim 2, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches the step of receiving said generic access instruction (paragraph [0064], lines 1 - 3); and accessing said data (paragraph [0064], lines 3 - 13).

Regarding claim 3, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches the step of storing said data comprises storing a portion of said data in an independent image format (paragraph [0020]).

Regarding claim 4, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches the step of generating a generic access request in response to

said generic access instruction (paragraphs [0027] and [0032]; Grasso discloses that a recommendation may be generated based on a determination of document-document similarity (similarity of the requested document to other documents in the recommender system).

Regarding claim 5, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises associating said data with a computer user (paragraphs [0028] and [0042]).

Regarding claim 6, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises utilizing server side technology (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Regarding claim 7, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises utilizing client side technology (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Regarding claims 8 and 13, Grasso teaches a method for outputting data (10, fig. 1) comprising the steps of providing a client having capability to execute a web browser (paragraphs [0022]; [0031]; Grasso discloses that the recommender system may create a map of what has been printed in a work group. This information can then be browsed or searched from an electronic interface 60 to the system 100), providing an extension (paragraph [0031]); configuring data partially obtained from an enterprise resource planning system (210, fig. 3; paragraph [0057]; [0058], lines 1 – 3; and [0062], lines 1 – 4; Grasso discloses a distributed knowledge management service provider, wherein said service provider is an enterprise resource planning uses to extract textual content

from captured documents and indexed); identifying said data to be accessed in response to a generic access instruction (paragraph [0058], lines 8 – 12; [0059]; and [0064]; Grasso discloses that the service provider 210 then transmits the print job to the user's printer 112 where the printed document is produced); communicating a first web content to said client containing a generic access instruction causing a portion of said data to be accessed (paragraph [0064]; Grasso discloses that the service provider may provide an XML interface through which document content and user requests can be passed between the user interface and the server).

Grasso teaches substantially all the limitations, except for the use of communicating a second web content from a printer incorporating a web server to said client providing capability for outputting said data, the capability for outputting said data comprising a print dialog box including at least one selectable option; and outputting said data.

However, Hamzy teaches, in an analogous art, methods and systems for print-processor modified printing, which comprises the step communicating a second web content from a printer incorporating a web server to said client providing capability for outputting said data, the capability for outputting said data comprising a print dialog box including at least one selectable option; and outputting said data (figs 2 – 4; col. 2, lines 38 – 52; col. 4, line 33 through col. 5, line 8).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Grasso by communicating a second web content from a printer incorporating a web server to said client providing capability for

outputting said data, the capability for outputting said data comprising a print dialog box including at least one selectable option; and outputting said data as evidenced by Hamzy for the purpose of allowing user(s) to print on a network printer from a thin client using a minimum of local resources, thereby reducing or eliminating the need for a great number of printer drivers and associated resources at the thin client.

Regarding claim 9, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises associating said data with a computer user (paragraphs [0028] and [0042]).

Regarding claim 10, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises utilizing client side technology (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Regarding claim 11, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that said identifying comprises utilizing server side technology (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Regarding claim 12, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further comprises tailoring said extension to characteristics of said client (paragraph [0064]; Grasso discloses that the service provider may provide an XML interface through which document content and user requests can be passed between the user interface and the server. Using an XML interface offers several advantages in that a number of user interfaces are available which would be tailored in order to communicate with the service provider).

Regarding claim 14, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Hamzy further teaches said outputting said data includes outputting to multiple devices (paragraphs [0045] – [0052]).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize such a modification in Grasso for the purpose of allowing user(s) to select in advance default options to avoid repeated operations each time printing is performed, thereby saving processing resources, transmission time, and memory.

Regarding claim 15, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that said generic access instruction causes a portion of said data to be accessed causes additional data to be accessed (paragraph [0057]; Grasso discloses that in addition to capturing to providing recommender services to users of recording devices, other document related services may also be provided).

Regarding claim 16, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that a portion of said communicating said first web content utilizes a firewall (paragraphs [0061] and [0063]).

Regarding claim 17, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further teaches that a portion of said communicating said first web content utilizes the Internet (paragraph [0063]).

Regarding claim 18, Grasso and Hamzy teach all the limitations in claim 8, and Grasso further comprising storing a portion of said data in an independent image format (paragraph [0020]).

Regarding claim 20, Grasso teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said generic access instruction causes said extension to access said data (paragraph [0058], lines 8 – 12; [0059]; and [0064]).

Regarding claim 21, Grasso teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said data represents an image having an independent format (paragraph [0020]).

Regarding claim 22, Grasso teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said generic access instruction causes a generic access request (paragraphs [0027] and [0032]; Grasso discloses that a recommendation may be generated based on a determination of document-document similarity (similarity of the requested document to other documents in the recommender system).

Regarding claim 23, Grasso teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said apparatus for implementing a generic access instruction includes communicating using the Internet (paragraphs [0028] and [0033]).

Regarding claim 24, Grasso teaches the system of claim 19, wherein said generic access instruction includes instruction communicated in hypertext transfer protocol (paragraph [0061], lines 9 - 14).

Regarding claim 25, Grasso teaches the system of claim 22, wherein said generic access request includes requests communicated by way of the Internet (paragraph [0063]).

Regarding claim 27, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said generic access instruction causes said extension to access said data (paragraph [0058], lines 8 – 12; [0059]; and [0064]).

Regarding claim 28, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said data from an enterprise resource planning system includes an image having an independent format (paragraph [0020]).

Regarding claim 29, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said extension causes said data to be output using said output device (paragraph [0028]).

Regarding claim 30, Grasso teaches the system of claim 29, wherein said data output includes data output using the Internet (paragraph [0063]).

Regarding claim 31, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said extension includes executing a browser (paragraph [0034]).

Regarding claim 32, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said extension includes the characteristics of said client (paragraph [0058], lines 8 – 12; [0059]; and [0064]; Grasso discloses that the service provider 210 then transmits the print job to the user's printer 112 where the printed document is produced).

Regarding claim 33, Grasso teaches the system of claim 26, wherein said data is associated with a user of said client (paragraphs [0028] and [0042]).

Regarding claim 34, Grasso teaches the system of claim 33, wherein said data is associated with said user using client side apparatus (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Regarding claim 35, Grasso teaches the system of claim 33, wherein said data is associated with said user using server side apparatus (paragraphs [0061] and [0064]).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yves Dalencourt

September 21, 2006


YVES DALENCOURT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100